UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,986	01/15/2002	Jennifer L. Hillman	PF-0168-3 DIV	3139

22428 7590 06/30/2004

FOLEY AND LARDNER
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER	
MITRA, RITA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1653	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/051,986	HILLMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rita Mitra	1653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 January 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-9,11,12,14,16,17,20,23,26,28,29,31 and 48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-9,11,12,14,16,17,20,23,26,28,29,31 and 48* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ ~~Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)~~ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)~~
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1 and 17, drawn to an isolated polypeptide selected from the group consisting of: a) a polypeptide comprising an amino acid sequence selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO: 1-7, b) a polypeptide comprising a naturally occurring amino acid sequence at least 90% identical to an amino acid sequence selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO: 1-7, c) a biologically active fragment of a polypeptide having an amino acid sequence selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO: 1-7, and d) an immunogenic fragment of a polypeptide having an amino acid sequence selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO: 1-7; a composition comprising the said polypeptide; classified in class 530, subclass 350; class 514, subclass 2.
Should Group I be elected, applicants are required to select one amino acid sequence from SEQ ID NO: 1-7.

II. Claims 4-9, 12 and 48, drawn to an isolated polynucleotide encoding a polypeptide comprising a polynucleotide sequence selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO: 8-14; a recombinant polynucleotide comprising a promoter sequence, cell transformed with recombinant polynucleotide; method producing polypeptide of claim 1; polynucleotide comprising a naturally occurring polynucleotide sequence at least 90% identical to a polynucleotide sequence selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO: 8-14; complimentary sequences and RNA equivalent thereof; an array comprising different nucleotide molecules affixed on solid substrate; a transgenic organism comprising a recombinant polynucleotide of claim 6; classified in class 435, subclass 69.1, 320.1, 252.3, 6; class 536, subclass 23.5; class 800, subclass 8+.

Should Group II be elected, applicants are required to select one sequence of nucleic acid from SEQ ID NO: 8-14 and one sequence of amino acids from SEQ ID NO: 1-7.

III. Claims 11 and 31, drawn to an antibody that specifically binds to a polypeptide of claim 1, wherein the antibody is a chimaric antibody, a single chain antibody, a fab fragment, a F(ab')2 fragment or a humanized antibody; classified in class 530, subclass 387.1+.

Should Group IV be elected, applicants are required to select one antibody from claim 31.

IV. Claims 14, 16, 28 and 29, drawn to a method for detecting a target polynucleotide in a sample, said target polynucleotide having a sequence of a polynucleotide of claim 12, comprising hybridizing the sample with a probe comprising at least 20 contiguous nucleotides; amplifying said target polynucleotide or fragment thereof using polymerase chain reaction; method of assessing toxicity of a test compound; a method of screening a compound for effectiveness in altering expression of a target polynucleotide, wherein the target polynucleotide comprises a sequence of claim 5 by exposing a sample comprising the said polynucleotide to a compound and detecting altered expression of the target polynucleotide in the sample; classified in class 536, subclass 23.1, 23.5, 24.3, 24.33; class 435, subclass 6, 7.1, 69.1, 320.1, 252.3.

Should Group IV be elected, applicants are required to select one polynucleotide sequence from SEQ ID NO: 8-14.

V. Claims 20, 23 and 26, drawn to a method of screening for a compound for effectiveness as an agonist or an antagonist of a polypeptide of claim 1 by exposing a sample comprising the said polypeptide to a compound and detecting agonist or antagonist activity in the sample; method of screening for a compound that specifically binds to the polypeptide of claim 1 comprising combining the

said polypeptide with at least one test compound and detecting the binding of the polypeptide to the test compound; classified in class 530, subclass 350, 300; class 435, subclass 7.1, 69.1.

Should Group VI be elected, applicants are required to select one amino acid sequence from SEQ ID NO: 1-7.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the polypeptide of invention I can be made by another materially distinct processes, such as purification from the natural source or by chemical synthesis. Therefore, the inventions are distinct.

The polypeptide of group I is related to the antibody of group III as being the antigen for the antibody. Although the protein and antibody are related, they are distinct inventions. The protein can be used in another and materially different process from the use for production of the antibody, such as in a pharmaceutical composition in its own right, or to assay or purify a receptor. Further, the protein of Group I and the antibody of group III are structurally and functionally distinct molecules with different amino acids and different sequence.

Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the polypeptide of group I is not necessary for the practice of invention of IV. Therefore the inventions are distinct.

Invention I is related to invention V as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the

product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Group I can be used in different process such as in the production of antibody.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the Antibody of group III is a separate and distinct chemical entity from nucleic acid of group II. The nucleic acid of Group II does not encode the antibody of Group III and is not used for the practice of Group III. Therefore the inventions are distinct.

Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the nucleic acid of Group II can be used on another, materially distinct process, such as recombinant production of protein.

Invention II and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the nucleic acid of Group II is not used for the practice of screening method of group V. Therefore the inventions are distinct.

Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antibody of Group III is not necessary for the practice of invention of IV. Therefore inventions are distinct.

Invention III is related to invention V as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP

§ 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antibody of group III can be used on another, materially distinct process, such as affinity chromatography.

Inventions IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the method of IV and V are directed to different ends and different effect. Method of IV detects a polynucleotide while method of V detects a compound that binds to a polypeptide. Therefore the inventions are distinct.

The restriction requires for a selection of a single sequence of polynucleotide sequence and a single sequence of amino acid sequence because each sequence has a different chemical and physical property (See specification pages 17-23). For example the nucleic acids encoding the RASP-5 has the nucleotide sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 12 and the RASP-5 protein has amino acid sequences of SEQ ID NO: 5 (page 21); while a RASP-7 nucleic acid molecule has the nucleotide sequence shown in SEQ ID NO: 14 and the RASP-7 protein has an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 7 (page 23). In addition the invention also includes other RAS gene proteins which have different nucleic acid and amino acid sequences (see Table 1, page 17), which are distinct from each other. Therefore, the use of each sequence in the method claims would have a different effect, for example use of a nucleic acid sequence from RASP-5 as a probe for the detection of nucleic acid in a sample may not detect the nucleic acid sequence of RASP-3 or RASP-4, while use of a polypeptide sequence of RASP-5 for identifying a compound that specifically binds to the polypeptide of RASP-5 may not detect the compounds that bind with the polypeptide of RASP-3 and RASP-4. Therefore each sequence is distinct from the other.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim

will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

A telephone call was made to Jeanni Labra on May 17, 2004, to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Rita Mitra whose telephone number is (571) 272-0954. The Examiner can normally be reached from 9:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on weekdays. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor Dr. Christopher Low, can be reached at (571) 272-0951. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Fax Center number is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0547.

CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Rita Mitra, Ph.D.
May 26, 2004